



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/756,831	01/08/2001	John Peter Karidis	RPS920000078US1	6862

7590 09/09/2003  
John Bruce Schelkopf  
IBM Corporation  
Legal Dept.  
Dept. 9CCA/Bldg.002-2  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

SHIN, CHRISTOPHER B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2182

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2003

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/756,831

Applicant(s)

KARIDIS, JOHN PETER

Examiner

Christopher B Shin

Art Unit

2182

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                              | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The Amendment received June 24, 2003 has been entered and carefully considered. Claims 1-14 are pending in the application.

### *Response to Arguments*

2. Applicant's arguments filed June 24, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- i. On pages 5-9, regarding claim 1, the applicant basically argues that the Trane reference does not teach the limitation regarding "widened display" area corresponding to "widened keyboard base". The applicant also argued that the meaning of "widened" as in width/horizontal dimension rather than vertical dimension.

Examiner traverses the argument. As can be seen from the teachings of figure 1, the keyboard base is widened/horizontally increased and such addition functions as part of the keyboard base. In addition or in combination, Trane additionally teaches, in column 7, lines 31-35, the motivation of choosing any "size" and "type" of display device into the portable assembly 10 of the Trans system. Therefore, the claimed invention of the claim 1 is obvious over the above combination teachings as a whole, as also can be seen from the art rejection details. Furthermore, figure 1 of the Trane reference further teaches the vertical dimension expansion, due to the accommodation of the (16), as well as the horizontal expansion, due to the (18) attachment.

- ii. On pages 9-10, in response to the argument/amendment of the claims 2-3, the examiner modify the rejection accordingly as follows.

- iii. On pages 10-11, in response to the argument of claims 4-6, the examiner traverses such argument. The examiner interprets the claimed "interposer" as "introduce or insert between parts" WEBSTER II dictionary. With that interpretation, the claims 4-6 read on the teachings of the Trane reference, as discussed in the art rejection.

- iv. On pages 12-14, in response to the argument of claims 7-10, the examiner traverses such argument. The examiner invites the applicant to further read the description sections of figures 3 & 6 (i.e., the descriptions of figure 6 explains the internal or circuit structures

of the figure 3-external structure). As can be seen from figure 6 & columns 9-10, the cell phone (16) equivalent of the claimed "I/O device" is operating, with MODEM, as communication means such as "telephone messaging", "facsimiles", "Internet connection" using "conventional" or "customized" "software" (see columns 9-10). In other words, the limitations of the claims 7-10 read on the above teachings.

v. On pages 14-end, in response to the rest of the claim arguments, the examiner traverses the argument for the above similar reasons.

For the above reasons, the examiner maintains the art rejection as follows:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trane (6,219,227).

i. In figures 1-3 & 6 and their respective description section of the Trane reference teaches all of the basic claimed limitations as follows:

Claims 1-10

Trane (6,219,227)

- a notebook computer with an I/O physical user interface
  - feature of figure 1 system
- base containing a keyboard for said notebook computer
  - feature of figure 1, (24)
- base has an extended portion beyond said keyboard creating a widened keyboard base
  - feature of figure 1, widened portion (16)
- widened display having a widened I/O display area corresponding to said widened keyboard base
  - feature of figure 1, (14)
- widened display having a width substantially equal to a width of said widened keyboard base
  - feature of (14 & 24)
- I/O device area disposed within said extended portion of said widened keyboard base

- feature of (16), figure 1
- interface signal connecting means mounted within said I/O device area, operable to couple signals from said notebook computer to an I/O device
  - feature of figures 3 & 6
- I/O device area, is recessed below a surface of the extended portion of said widened keyboard base, operable to receive said I/O device
  - obvious modification of feature of (46), figure 3
- interface signal connection means is disposed within said recessed I/O device area
  - feature of (54), figures 3 & 6, see columns 5-6, lines 44-13
- 10 - interface connection interposer (ICI) is disposed between said interface signal connection means and said I/O device, disposed within said recessed I/O device area
  - feature of figures 3 & 6
  - (ICI) operable compensate for both mechanical and signal routing differences between said interface signal connection means, said recessed I/O area and said I/O device
    - feature of figures 3 & 6
- 16 - widened I/O display area is used to display operational data relative to operation of said I/O device when said I/O device is sending or receiving signals to said notebook computer
  - feature of columns 9-10, lines 43-6, figures 3 & 6
- 18 - first/second communication software instructions controlling communication between said notebook and said I/O device
  - feature of columns 9-10, lines 43-6, figures 3 & 6
- I/O device has functionality wholly separate from any communication signaling or connection with said notebook
  - feature of (48), figures 3 & 6

ii. As for the claims 1 & 3-10, the difference between the claimed invention and teachings of the Trane reference is that the reference does not identically or expressly teach the claimed limitation "widened display". However, such limitation is an obvious design choice matter to one having ordinary skill in the art. This is because, the Trane reference teaches, in column 7, lines 27-35, the motivation of using any size display according to the designer's choice. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one having ordinary skill in the art to come up with the claimed invention for the reasons stated above, since all of the basic limitations and the motivation are disclosed by the Trane reference.

iii. As per claim 2, further limits the location of the I/O device to be extended portion rather than vertical portion; however, such location is an obvious design matter. One skilled in the art can simply choose to utilize any sections/portions of the keyboard base surface.

Besides, there are only four sizes to utilize; the either of horizontal sections of the base surface are already being used by printer and paper tray, and the bottom vertical side is taken up by pointing device. As a result, it is only obvious to use only remaining top vertical side, unless the designer simply choose to differently arrange/locate the device.

iv. As for the claims 11-14, due to the similarity between the claims 1-10 & the claims 11-14 are not patentably distinctive from claims 1-10, the teachings of the claims 1-10 are similarly applied.

5. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trane (6,219,227) in view of Saeguse (5,568,224).

i. The teachings of Trane on claims 1-14 are similarly applied (see above for the teachings/rejection details

ii. As can be seen from the Saeguse reference, column 2, lines 51-53, teaches “notebook 3 is capable of wide screen display based on a dot LCD and incorporates a communication function. This is another/additional more specific support/evidence of the examiner’s 103 motivation “obvious design choice” rationale. As can be seen above from the teachings of Trane, the Trane reference teaches the motivation to use any size/type of display and the Saeguse specifically teaches wide screen display on a notebook that was well known at the time of the invention. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the Trane & Saeguse references to come up with the invention for the reasons state above.

### *Conclusion*

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

**7. Any Response To This Action Should Be Mailed To:**

**If The Action Is Non-Final**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 746-7239, (for formal communications intended for entry)

**If The action is Final**

**Box AF**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 746-7238, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE")

**Hand-delivered responses should be brought to**

Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

**Any Other Telephone Communication Should Be Directed To**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mr. Shin whose telephone number is (703) 305-9658. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 7:00 AM to 4:00 PM.

Christopher B. Shin  
September 7, 2003

*Christopher B. Shin*

**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

**ART UNIT 2182**

